

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-16 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 were objected to, and claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-16 were rejected in the Non-Final Office Action mailed January 23, 2012.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 were objected to because of an alleged spelling error in claim 1. Applicant traverses this objection. The Examiner refers a spelling error “medial filter” in claim 1, line 13. However, no such error currently exists since Applicants corrected this spelling error in the last Amendment filed January 6, 2012. Thus, Applicants request withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9-16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosma et al (US 6,443,972) in view of Greenhalgh (US 6,364,895) and Weaver (US 2004/0186510). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would arrive at a second filter section comprising twice as many filter cells as the first filter section based Bosma et al. in view of the higher-density filtering section of Greenhalgh, and secondary optimization. However, Greenhalgh teaches an increased density filtering defined by braided yarns added to the braided wires. It does not provide any teaching or suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art how to accomplish a higher density filtering section with only wires. As recited in claim 1, “the struts define a first and second filter section and a center section connecting the filter sections,” therefore the teachings of Greenhalgh are not relevant. Accordingly, in view of the differences between the applied references and the presently claimed invention, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Bosma et al. in view of Greenhalgh in further fire of Weaver.

With respect to the dependent claims, they are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants would like to note, however, that the Examiner’s rejections of claim 9-16 do not address all recited subject matter therein, and request further detailed explanation of how the Examiner finds these claims obvious, if he maintains the rejections. Applicants, of course, however request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow the claims.

Serial No. 10/592,908

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the present application is now fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain that may be addressed by a phone conversation, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee and any other fees which may be required by this paper to Deposit Account 10-0750/CRD5080USPCT/KM. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-0750/CRD5080USPCT/KM.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Kristin Menon/
Kristin Menon
Reg. No. 56,869

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(510) 248-2824
Dated: April 23, 2012